



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/666,280	09/21/2000	Kyoung Ro Yoon	P-127	8463

34610 7590 10/06/2003

FLESHNER & KIM, LLP  
P.O. BOX 221200  
CHANTILLY, VA 20153

EXAMINER
----------

DUONG, OANH L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

9

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/666,280

Applicant(s)

YOON ET AL.

Examiner

Oanh L. Duong

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Claim Objections***

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: "which" in line 11 does not have a clear meaning. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the personal reference" in lines 4-5.

Claim 20 recites the limitation "the information consumer", "the user information" in lines 9-10; "the preference item" in line 15.

Claim 22, "the hierarchical structure" in line 5.

There are insufficient antecedent basis for those above limitations in the claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1-7 and 9-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fruensgaard et al (Fruensgaard) (US 2002/0052880).

Regarding claim 1, Fruensgaard teaches person information to identify each user (e.g., see page 2 paragraph 27); user preference information of the identified user (e.g., see page 1 paragraph 3); and one or more individual user preference, each of which can be set differently depending on the user's situations such as different location (e.g., see page 3 paragraph 56), and which is located as a sub-tree of the user preference information (e.g., see page 9 paragraph 204).

Regarding claim 2, Fruensgaard teaches a unique identifier which can be used to identify said user (e.g., see page 4 paragraph 95).

Regarding claim 3, Fruensgaard teaches one or more history record of information usage by said user (e.g., see page 2 paragraph 44)

Regarding claim 4, Fruensgaard teaches a list of information or information identifier with when and how the information is used (e.g., see page 3 paragraph 54 and paragraph 56).

Regarding claim 5, Fruensgaard teaches the history record includes a condition of history collection for each history record (e.g., see page 2 paragraph 39).

Regarding claim 6, Fruensgaard teaches the condition of history collection includes location of the history location (e.g., see page 6 paragraph 151).

Regarding claim 7, Fruensgaard teaches time of the history collection (e.g., see page 2 paragraph 39).

Regarding claim 9, Fruensgaard teaches each individual user preference information includes a user preference item and a value representing preference/non-preference information (e.g., see page 6 paragraph 154)

Regarding claim 10, Fruensgaard teaches each user preference information includes a description information on the said user preference item (e.g., see page 2 paragraph 39).

Regarding claim 11, Fruensgaard teaches each user preference item includes description on the item that can be used as a condition of using the individual user preference information for searching or filtering a multi-media information (e.g., see page (e.g., see page 2 paragraph 39).

Regarding claim 12, Fruensgaard teaches each individual user preference information has a hierarchical relationship (e.g., see page 9 paragraph 202).

Regarding claim 13, Fruensgaard teaches user preference item has a hierarchical relationship (e.g., see page 9 paragraphs 204-211).

Regarding claim 14, Fruensgaard teaches hierarchical relationships are hierarchical tree structures (e.g., see page 9 paragraph 204).

Regarding claim 15, Fruensgaard teaches individual user preference can be differently set depending on said user's selection or said user's terminal device (e.g., see page 2 paragraphs 39-44 and page 5 paragraph 132).

Regarding claims 16 and 17, Fruensgaard teaches each individual user preference information has hierarchical structure which is represented by the identifier

of the user preference item located in the higher nodes of the tree structure (e.g., see page 9 paragraph 204).

Regarding claim 18, Fruensgaard teaches each user preference information has a hierarchical structure which is represented by an external item dictionary (e.g., see page 2 paragraph 44 and page 9 paragraphs 196-204).

Regarding claim 19, Fruensgaard teaches hierarchical structure is represented by a coding scheme, only the individual user preference information located as the leaf nodes of the hierarchical tree structure are stored, and the individual user preference information located at non-leaf nodes of the hierarchical tree structure are extracted based on the relationship among the leaf nodes and upper nodes items (e.g., see page 3 paragraph 49-54).

Regarding claim 20, Fruensgaard teaches a method for providing multimedia information to the information consumer using the user information with multiple hierarchical structure in the multimedia information environment where information providers desired information of information consumers (e.g., see abstract and page 5 paragraphs 116-128), comprising the steps of establishing multiple multi-level hierarchical structure of individual user preference information distinguished by each user and each search item (e.g., see page 9 paragraphs 196-215); searching desired information based on the preference item with preference/nonpreference information by each user and each search item (e.g., see abstract); and providing retrieved information according to the user preference information (e.g., see page 4 paragraphs 72 and 76).

Regarding claim 21, Fruensgaard teaches in step of said providing the retrieved information, retrieval of new information is notified to the user, or information expected to be preferred by the user is recommended to the user, or information expected not to be preferred by the user is limited to access, according to the individual user preference information (e.g., see page 2 paragraph 37).

Regarding claim 22, Fruensgaard teaches a method comprising establishing a multiple hierarchical structure having individual user preference formation for each user or each group of user (e.g., see page 9 paragraphs 196-215); and changing the hierarchical structure of the individual user preference information (e.g., see page 2 paragraphs 43-44 and page 4 paragraph 82).

Regarding claim 23, Fruensgaard teaches changing the hierarchical structure of said individual user preference information includes registration of new user preference item, deletion of an existing user preference item, or changing the parent node of a sub-tree of individual user preference information (e.g., see page 1 paragraph 3).

Regarding claim 24, Fruensgaard teaches changing the preference/nonpreference value of a user preference item and changing the preference/nonpreference value of user preference items located in the ancestor nodes of the changed preference item based on the usage history (e.g., see page 3 paragraphs 50-53).

Regarding claim 25, changing the hierarchical structure of the individual user preference information, the preference/non-preference value is changed using a user interface (e.g., see page 3 paragraphs 46-49)

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fruensgaard (US 2002/0052880) in view of Rubert (US 6366915 B1).

Regarding claim 8, Fruensgaard does not explicitly teach authorization information to identify the information which said user can access. However, Rubert teaches authorization information to identify the information which said user can access (e.g., see col. 18 lines 29-34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the authorization information in Fruensgaard as taught by Rubert because such information would ensure that the user has authorization to access the requested information. Thus query specification, query execution and query result retrieval would have occurred efficiently and securely (Rubert, see abstract).

***Conclusion***

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Oanh L. Duong whose telephone number is (703) 305-0295. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 8:00AM - 5:30PM.



Application/Control Number: 09/666,280  
Art Unit: 2155

Page 8

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



O.D  
September 29, 2003



**HOSAIN ALAM**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**